LABOUR MONTHLY

Founded 1921 Editor: R. Palme Dutt

How Disarmament can be won

PROBLEMS OF DISARMAMENT
R. Palme Dutt

THE REV. CANON L. J. COLLINS
Forward from Aldermaston

*

JOHN NEWTON
Planning Council Aims

APRIL 1962

One Shilling and Sixpence

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ON THE MARCH

AN AMERICAN VISITOR to Britain, sight-seeing round Westminster last month, was much interested in the vast queue, four abreast, stretching from the House of Lords to the St. Stephens' entrance of the House of Commons. He was told: 'It's a lobby.' This seemed to him impossible: 'Come again? But who are they all?' Miners, a marshal told him (—'and railwaymen', broke in a voice from the queue). The visitor found it hard to take in. 'To him "lobby" seems a dirty word,' a Scottish miner told me later. 'It means professional pressure groups, like the Oil Lobby, or the China Lobby. He'd never seen amateur leaguers like us, a democratic lobby of the people themselves in action. He could hardly believe his ears when we told him that far from being paid for it, we were losing two and three days' money.' My friend from one of Fife's biggest pits chuckled: 'We gave him something to write home about!' And it was not only the visitor from U.S.A. who was given something to write home about by this immense demonstration, organised by the Scottish Miners' Executive, but comprising representatives of whole communities north of the border. They made a big impression. I was especially delighted to meet railwaymen and see at least a couple of hundred, members of both the National Union of Railwaymen and of the Associated Society of Locomotive Enginemen and Firemen, on the march in amicable unity with the miners. Whilst I saw many firm *Labour Monthly* readers and old friends—including some whom I recognised from the Scots Miners' Lobby which had such a powerful effect in 1959—I was impressed by the number of marchers who had never before taken part in any political demonstration. (And I was glad of the chance to put over 50 L.M.S into new hands.)

Memories of earlier struggles in the coalfield of South Wales will be stirred by the verses on page 177 written by an unemployed miner during the lock-out in Clydach Vale. A carefully preserved copy, printed for wide distribution at the time, was sent to me from Wales last month. *'Backslider'* writes: 'I liked your reviews of the old days. Good old Tom Mann!' A *South Coast* veteran recalls how he joined the Independent Labour Party 'in 1906 or 1907. It was a year or two before that my sister took me on a visit to Birmingham to see chain-making, nail-making, hook-and-eye carding and other samples of sweated trades.' My own mother-in-law was telling me only last month of the days of her dress-making apprenticeship, in 1895: 'We worked from 6 a.m. to 6 p.m., except on our early day, which stopped at 4 p.m.: we could then go home after we had cleaned the room and picked up *all* the pins. No pay the first year, and a shilling a week the next'. Memories of the struggle of a veteran in the peace movement, are recalled by his son, an *Edinburgh* reader, who is mourning the loss of a grand supporter of peace and socialism. He fought to prevent three world wars: first, in July, 1914; then to prevent World War II; and more lately against the world war which we shall not allow to begin. He lived to see his son and grandson engage in the battle against Polaris at Holy Loch (where they suffered savage fines.) Our friend writes of him 'Man's only immortality, the living memories in the

(Continued on page iii of cover)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Notes of the Month

PROBLEMS OF DISARMAMENT

If on this earth we are not able to live as living beings were able to live in Noah's Ark, and if we start a war to settle disputes between states—some dislike socialism, some dislike capitalism—we shall destroy our Noah's Ark, the earth.

(*N. S. Khrushchov at Vienna,* July, 1960.)

EVERYBODY today is for disarmament—in principle. Every Government. Every statesman. Every nation. Every political party. Yet nothing happens. Why?

April is the month of Aldermaston. Aldermaston has become a world symbol of the popular revolt against nuclear arms and nuclear war. This year it is likely to win an even wider concourse of support than ever. The Six who were recently sentenced to long terms of imprisonment have won the respect of all decent people. Universal contempt has been expressed for the Government's prosecution and the gagging of world famous scientists who came to give evidence that the nuclear installations in Britain have nothing in common with the defence of Britain. Hundreds have besieged the police stations to offer themselves for arrest alongside the Six. In the stolidly sluggish Tory cold-war Britain of the past decade this is a sign of a stirring among wide sections, especially of young people, never before drawn into political activity. It is the counterpart of the stirring in the industrial field against the

CONTENTS

Vol. XLIV APRIL · 1962

	Page
NOTES OF THE MONTH: 1. *Problems of Disarmament;* 2. *Bertrand Russell's Mathematical Philosophy;* 3. *Modern Nuclear Strategy and Disarmament,* by R.P.D.	145
NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT: FORWARD FROM ALDERMASTON, by the Rev. Canon L. John Collins	161
AN EASTER OFFERING, 1922, by George Chicherin	163
GENEVA, 1962, by Quæstor ...	165
THE AIM BEHIND THE PLANNING COUNCIL, by John Newton ...	169
A SHOUT FROM THE PEOPLE, by Guy Stobbs, Peter, McQuade, Willie Anderson, Alec Wilson	172
THE 'BLINDFOLDED' GIANTS, by Henry Purcell	178
CUBA TRAVEL NOTES (II), by D. N. Pritt, Q.C.	185
Book Reviews: The Levellers and the English Revolution, by H. N. Brailsford: London and the Outbreak of the Puritan Revolution, by Dr. Valerie Pearl: *Dipak Nandy*	190

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Tory offensive. It is the counterpart of new signs in recent by-elections.

Yes. There is no doubt of the universal extending popular revolt against nuclear weapons and nuclear war in all countries. Even in the United States the nuclear shelter racket, however much encouraged by government policy in order to break in and condition public opinion to the idea of nuclear war as inevitable and even tolerable, is in fact a symptom of panic alarm and of a desperate search for illusory solutions rather than of any satisfaction with the prospect. But how to translate this universal popular anger and revolt against nuclear war into effective positive results so as to banish in fact the menace of nuclear war and destroy all nuclear weapons? Here is the crux. Emotion alone, however burning, however sincere, however self-sacrificing, can achieve nothing, can change nothing, unless it is harnessed to a policy related to the real world and capable of achieving results in the real world. The problem is a political problem.

Discussion

During these months we have invited and printed contributions from the leading representatives of the fight against nuclear weapons and nuclear war to present their viewpoint on the problems involved. In January we printed a contribution from Professor J. D. Bernal, President of the World Peace Council, reviewing the argument of Bertrand Russell's 'Has Man a Future?' Last month we printed a contribution from Bertrand Russell, previously President of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament and now the inspirer and leading representative of the Committee of 100, explaining his viewpoint. This month we print a contribution from Canon Collins, Chairman of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, dealing with the significance of Aldermaston and the problem of disarmament. Professor P. M. S. Blackett, whose 'Military and Political Consequences of Atomic Energy' in 1948 played so significant a rôle in opening up the new questions, has published in the *New Statesman* of March 2 an important and informed concrete survey, on the basis of available information and estimates, of the present actual strategic situation and the questions arising, under the title, 'The Real Road to Disarmament: The Military Background to the Geneva Talks'. In all these contributions the aim to prevent nuclear war, the aim of nuclear and general disarmament is common. But the estimates and the tactical conclusions differ. Within the unity

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the common struggle against nuclear weapons and nuclear war it is necessary to examine these differences frankly in order to see how far it is possible to reach agreed and valid conclusions.

Geneva Disarmament Conference

What are the prospects of the new Geneva Disarmament Conference of the 18 Nations Committee set up by the U.N. which has opened with 17 nations on March 14? There is no doubt that this Disarmament Conference represents the climax and supreme attempt so far (with the sands visibly running down) to reach a positive result after a prolonged series of previous unfruitful exchanges. It is not surprising that, despite the new and grave conditions of the world, weary scepticism has hitherto hung over every disarmament conference in view of the endless previous record of deadlocks and fiascos, interleaved by world wars, throughout this century, from the Hague Conference before the first world war, through the dismal series at Geneva between the wars, to the new series in the United States after the second world war. The only success claimed in this long record, the Washington Naval Limitation Treaty of 1922, was in fact not in the sphere of any general reduction of armaments, but a resolution of the sharp Anglo-American naval antagonism immediately following the first world war by the British surrender of its historic command of the seas to accept American naval parity which soon became in fact American naval supremacy.

Warning of Past Failures

Thirty-five years have passed since the Soviet Union startled the Geneva Disarmament Preparatory Committee in 1927 by tabling a motion for general and complete disarmament which the horrified Western powers all rejected. After the second world war the unrepresentative voting machinery of the United Nations, giving the minority grouping of the Western imperialist powers a supposedly permanent built-in majority, was used to vote down every Soviet proposal for banning nuclear weapons and propose instead a plan for an American world nuclear dictatorship (the Baruch Plan) outside the United Nations. When this dream vanished, discussions in commissions and committees still dominated by the Western minority went on through the fifties. In 1960 the Ten Nations Conference, with five a side, sought to correct the balance, but ended in deadlock. The present Geneva Conference represents an attempt to break the deadlock between the socialist and Western

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

states by the inclusion of eight 'uncommitted' or less committed nations, and in this way to make the composition a less falsified reflection of the world, though still excluding the largest state, with one quarter of the world's population.

Unfavourable Omens

Nevertheless, it is necessary to face the facts plainly. The initial signs provided by the events immediately preceding the conference have not been favourable. The British nuclear blast at Nevada on March 1 took place within a fortnight of the conference. On the following day President Kennedy announced the intention to conduct a series of nuclear tests on the British-ruled Christmas Island and elsewhere in the Pacific during April, that is, during the conference, unless the American version of a test ban treaty should be accepted beforehand in place of the Soviet draft test ban treaty which was rejected by the Western powers when they broke up the test ban conference. Twice in formal Notes the Western powers rejected the proposal for a Summit Conference of Heads of State at the outset of the Disarmament Conference to launch it and guide it for success in place of allowing it to fall into the usual rut in the hands of subordinates into which, as noted, all former conferences had fallen. It would be premature when commenting at the beginning of its meeting to jump to final conclusions, or to ignore the possibility of further international exchanges which might improve the situation. But it is evident that there is here a sufficiently thorny situation to require the earnest attention of all who would desire to banish the menace of nuclear war and promote nuclear and general disarmament.

Open Hostility to Disarmament

The unconcealed hostility of the American cold war advocates to the very idea of the Disarmament Conference was evident even before its assembling:

> The President and his chief advisers are now reliably reported to feel that the forthcoming Geneva Conference is likely to do the Western cause more harm than good. . . . The *New York Times*, accurately reflecting the views now prevalent in the American Government, affirms: 'The spectre of doom is rising about the 18-nation disarmament conference even before it opens.' (*Sunday Times*, February 25, 1962.)

The measuring rod, it will be noted, which is applied by the American Administration to the Geneva Conference is the interests

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of 'the Western cause'—not the interests of disarmament, not the interests of mankind to be freed from the menace of nuclear weapons. Such an approach would scarcely suggest a co-operative approach to the tasks of the conference. But it reveals the still continuing blindness of Western official quarters to the gravity of the problem. This open prior assumption, and almost gloating prior assumption, from the side of the American Administration, of the supposed inevitable failure of the Geneva Conference needs to be taken into account, when the flowery speeches may be made at the outset or the crocodile tears shed after the event. The timing of the tests to coincide with the conference inevitably recalls the timing of the flight of the U2 over the Soviet Union on the eve of the planned Summit Conference two years ago to sabotage and wreck that conference.

Danger of Complacency

This blind complacency in relation to the menace of nuclear war, and the present attempt to indoctrinate American opinion to accept it as a possibly necessary and manageable contingency like a fire disaster, is a shocking thing. The gravity of the present situation is most sharply recognised by those who know most. That is why the present question of disarmament in modern world conditions bears no relation to the old interminable disarmament discussions. It is a new world situation. Questions involving the future of this planet of ours and of human life upon it are coming up on the anvil of decision. The dimensions of the problem are changing and expanding every day at an accelerating rate. More than one power has now been able to circle the earth in outer space. The approach to a landing on the moon is close. From any point on this planet instruments of such destructive power that a handful could wipe out historic nation-states and countries in a fraction of time can now be projected with unfailing accuracy to any other point. If the race continues some American technicians have calculated that satellites armed with such weapons could soon be circling the earth to threaten at a moment's notice any spot and any people. The latest Soviet announcement of the production of an invulnerable rocket missile which can reach any point on earth without the possibility of interception, emphasises the urgency of the question of disarmament in present conditions. This is a new situation in human history. It bears no parallel to any previous arms race or menace of war.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Principle and Practice

Every thinking person, irrespective of nation or political outlook, is aware that this situation imperatively demands an urgent response of collective statesmanship from the political leaders of the world to meet it by the only solution which is any longer commensurate with the new technological conditions—general and complete disarmament, with whatever accompanying inspection and control is necessary to ensure its fulfilment. In principle this is today recognised and affirmed by the representatives of every state in the world. But in practice? In the actual present stage of international political relations we see a very different picture, which is far from corresponding to the professions of recognition of urgency and of the collective responsibilities of world statesmanship. Why? It is here that we come to the heart of the problem which is so acutely reflected in this crucial question of disarmament. For this problem cannot be resolved by the most far-reaching generalisations, the most hair-raising prophecies of doom or the most moving emotional appeals to urgency. It is a problem which is rooted in the real contradictions of the present world situation. And therefore it is a problem which will require the most serious political understanding, and the mass political action of the peoples all over the world, to overcome the obstacles and defeat the menace inherent in this modern world situation.

2. *Bertrand Russell's Mathematical Philosophy*

Let us consider the argument presented in Bertrand Russell's contribution in our last month's issue. Every one will join in paying tribute to Bertrand Russell, not only as one of the most eminent thinkers of our age, but as a courageous and selfless fighter for every cause he has embraced in the service of mankind. When a sage in his ninetieth year elects to face a prison sentence (not his first) from a society which disgraces itself by sending such a citizen to prison for his advocacy of passive resistance against nuclear weapons, or when he stands bareheaded in the snowstorm on Trafalgar Square to speak to the people, all can feel for him only the deepest respect and affection, irrespective of differences on specific issues or tactics within the common fight against nuclear weapons. We are sure our readers will all join in saluting him and wishing him well on his approaching ninetieth birthday next month on May 18. But the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

argument raised by him in his contribution has to be faced and pursued; for it involves the success or failure of the fight against nuclear war.

Theory of Parity of A and B

Bertrand Russell is a distinguished mathematical philosopher. Unfortunately he tends to see politics in mathematical terms. The dialectical method is to him a closed book; Hegel and Marx are hateful to his English empiricism. His theory of the nuclear problem is the theory of the parity of A and B. There are two main nuclear powers in the world: the United States and the Soviet Union. Britain, he recognises, is hardly worth calling a nuclear power, and its special problem would be correctly met by unilateral disarmament. He notes no less justly that unilateral disarmament could not be suitable as a policy for either the United States or the Soviet Union: ('I do not advocate unilateral nuclear disarmament for America; I advocate a Soviet-American agreement to disarm', Russell, Letter to *The Times,* September 22, 1961). Thus the problem is the problem of two nuclear powers, America and Russia. Since they are both nuclear powers, they are equal to one another. They are both, or 'the men in power' in both, are 'nuclear butchers'. 'I am indifferent to the ideology which provides the language in which they couch their cruelty'. The mathematical equation is absolute. No account is taken of the concrete living world situation; the initiating responsibility of developing nuclear weapons and nuclear strategy; the open sponsorship of nuclear strategy as the ideal of 'push-button war' in contrast to the consistent opposition to nuclear strategy; the public boasting of nuclear monopoly and the resulting subsequent defensive development of nuclear weapons in order to break that monopoly and thus open the way to nuclear disarmament. All this reality is ignored under cover of the seemingly impartial formula 'I am indifferent to ideology'. Both are criminal nuclear powers. Nothing is left for weeping humanity save to break its head in passive resistance against the cruel powers that be in the hope of averting doom. A gloomy prospect, corresponding to the profoundly pessimistic outlook of his earlier 'Free Man's Worship'.

Logical Advocacy of Atomic War in 1947

The disadvantage of this mathematical-metaphysical approach is that it can lead to precisely the opposite conclusions. The seemingly

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

classless impartial above-the-battle attitude was not always so absolute and impartial, so long as the United States appeared alone to have atomic weapons and the Soviet Union to have none. Pure logic then led Russell to the opposite conclusion. A single world authority was desirable: the United States, in possession of nuclear weapons, should establish such a single world nuclear authority, and, if necessary, conduct an atomic war on the Soviet Union to compel acceptance. Later, when reminded of his previous advocacy of a preventive atomic war against the Soviet Union, Russell at first issued a categoric denial, denouncing the allegation as 'a communist invention' (*New York Nation*, October 17, 1953), and threatening the *New Statesman* with legal proceedings for repeating it. Only when faced with the inescapable record of his own words he had finally to admit the facts ('Why I Changed My Mind', *Saturday Evening Post*, May 31, 1958) and apologise for having falsely charged the communists with lying:

> Although it may seem incredible, I believed the statement to be entirely correct at the time when I made it. I had in fact completely forgotten that I had ever thought a policy of threat involving possible war desirable. In 1958 Mr. Alfred Kohlberg and Mr. Walter W. Marseille brought to my notice things which I had said in 1947, and I read these with amazement. I have no excuse to offer.
>
> (Earl Russell in *The Listener*, May 28, 1959.)

A Revealing Interview

When reminded of this episode in a television interview with John Freeman in 1959, Russell's answers were revealing:

RUSSELL: At that time nuclear weapons existed only on one side, and therefore the odds were that the Russians would have given way.

FREEMAN: Suppose they hadn't given way . . . you would have used these weapons on the Russians, in spite of the words you have used to me about their horror?

RUSSELL: I should . . . I thought, then, and hoped that the Russians would give way, but of course you can't threaten unless you are prepared to have your bluff called.

It would not be right to call Russell in his advocacy then of a preventive atomic war against the Soviet Union 'a criminal', in the way that he today so freely brands Khrushchov. Perhaps it would be more just to say that his pursuit of abstract logic for a tidy world scheme, covering unconscious class assumptions, had led him to criminal conclusions.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

How the Soviet Bomb Converted Russell to Nuclear Disarmament

If Bertrand Russell has become converted from his previous advocacy of a preventive atomic war against the Soviet Union to his present advocacy of nuclear disarmament, it is to the Soviet bomb that he can express appropriate gratitude for his conversion. He should not revile his saviour. As he has himself correctly said, so long as he believed that the West had a nuclear monopoly, he was ready to advocate a preventive nuclear war of the West against the Soviet Union. By 1949 the Western nuclear monopoly was broken, ten years earlier than the Western military experts had predicted. Russell's advocacy of a preventive atomic war had been before 1949. By breaking the Western nuclear monopoly the Soviet Union compelled the Western representatives to retreat from the previous dreams of nuclear omnipotence and invincible preventive nuclear wars and begin to consider the problems of nuclear disarmament. Thus, the Soviet bomb has been a powerful weapon for nuclear disarmament. When Soviet scientific and technological superiority in the nuclear and rocket field became conspicuously demonstrated to all, first with the prior development of the hydrogen bomb in 1953, and still more with the Sputnik in 1957, increasing sections of Western opinion, which had been prepared to support the atom bomb under Attlee and Truman, now began to press actively for nuclear disarmament. The first Sputnik orbited the earth in October, 1957. In November, 1957, the Direct Action Committee Against Nuclear War was formed. In February, 1958, the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament was launched. During the four years since then, inspiring mass support has been won; and Russell's courageous rôle, whatever the tactical disputes among different sections of supporters of nuclear disarmament, has won him universal honour.

Mythology and History

Nevertheless, there still remain serious misconceptions, unconsciously absorbed from the Western imperialist climate even by a veteran radical dissenter like Russell, which require to be cleared away in order to lay bare the truth of the problem of nuclear disarmament. Russell says that the 'evolution' of strategic bombing ('the dropping of explosives from the sky') has developed over 'a period of some thirty years', that is, from 1931. He is mistaken. The first primitive development was by the Western imperialist powers in the first world war. The first systematic development of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the doctrine of 'strategic bombing' (bombing of civilians as a main method of war) was by Britain and the R.A.F. under Trenchard. The first conspicuous peace-time demonstration of strategic bombing was the bombing of the villages of Iraq by the first Labour Government in 1924. In face of the wide protest from the labour movement, the unhappy pacifist who had been appointed Under-Secretary of State for Air, had to explain that this was found a more economical way of punishing villagers for non-payment of taxes than the old-fashioned method of sending a punitive expedition. The same method was tried on the North-West Frontier. Thus strategic bombing developed as a typical *colonial* method of British imperialism, later transferred to Europe, taken over by Nazism and fascism in Spain, and carried to extreme lengths by all the Western imperialist powers in the second world war. It was the British War Cabinet which adopted in 1942 the formal decision to concentrate the bombing offensive on working class houses on the grounds that military objectives were too difficult to find. Nazism carried the method forward with the V2 rocket. This was the strategy which found its culmination in the atom bomb and Hiroshima. All this was the strategy of Western imperialism.

Anglo-American War Doctrine

Sir Charles Snow has noted that this theory of strategic bombing, or terror-bombing of civilians as the means of victory, has been the characteristic Anglo-American modern theory of war:

> The English and Americans had for years past believed in strategic bombing as no other countries had. Countries which had thought deeply about war, like Germany and Russia, had no faith in strategic bombing and had not invested much productive capacity or many élite troops in it. The English had, years before the war began. The strategy had not been thought out. It was just an unrationalised article of faith that strategic bombing was likely to be our most decisive method of making war.
>
> (Sir Charles Snow, *Science and Government*, 1960, p. 47.)

This was the Anglo-American theory of war which thus found its logical continuation, with the advance to the nuclear age, in the Anglo-American atom bomb, in Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and in the Anglo-American Fulton theory of nuclear supremacy, nuclear strategy and the 'nuclear deterrent'. Soviet nuclear development in the strategic field has only followed subsequently to answer the open Anglo-American nuclear threat and to defeat and bring to an end this nuclear strategy. To fail to recognise this distinction, and the consequent core of responsibility, in the name of a spurious 'imparti-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ality' which ignores historical facts, is not only singularly unbecoming on the part of a citizen of Britain or the United States, but means in practice to fail to grapple with the real problem and to substitute general denunciation for a serious policy.

Path from Hiroshima

Russell says of Hiroshima that at the time 'it was believed that this final outrage would mean the end of war'. He is mistaken. All who followed events seriously realised that this was not the last act of the war against Japan, but the first act of the Anglo-American cold war against the Soviet Union. If he will consult these Notes for September, 1945, written within a fortnight of the dropping of the atom bomb, he will see there the full analysis of the significance of Hiroshima in terms of the loudly proclaimed theory of Anglo-American world domination on the basis of the atom bomb against the Soviet Union (the very theory to which Russell fell a victim), and the exposure of that theory on the grounds that the monopoly would not be maintained, and that the consequent domination would more likely prove to be, not of Anglo-American imperialism over the Soviet Union, but of United States imperialism over Britain. All this was written within a fortnight of the dropping of the bomb. Russell describes how 'the planet is covered with rocket bases, and H-bombers patrol the skies'. But he does not mention that it is the American and British system of overseas nuclear bases which are spread in countries all over the world, and that the Soviet Union has repeatedly proposed in vain the withdrawal of all bases; or that it is American H-bombers which patrol the skies. To mention the real facts of the world situation would ruin the symmetry of his theory of mathematical parity of A and B. So the facts have to be falsified to fit the theory. But incorrect analysis leads to incorrect diagnosis.

Positive Fight for Disarmament

Why is it so important to see clearly, to understand, to study seriously the real living forces of the world situation today, where are the advocates and where are the opponents of nuclear strategy? This is vital for the success of the fight against nuclear weapons and against nuclear war. It is not a question here of partisanship between socialism and imperialism as social and political systems. It is a question of understanding where are the allies of all who seek to end the horror of nuclear war, in order to mobilise the strength of the majority of the peoples of the world for victory. Without this

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

understanding the nuclear disarmer is reduced to a despairing impotence of general denunciation of all 'nuclear powers' as 'criminals' and empty appeals in the air to atomised individuals in all countries to disobey. On the contrary. It is precisely the combined strength of the socialist countries, the newly independent countries and all engaged in the national liberation struggle, and the mass of the labour movement and all supporters of peace in the Western capitalist countries, representing the overwhelming majority of mankind, which can defeat the menace of nuclear war and finally win the day for disarmament.

3. *Modern Nuclear Strategy and Disarmament*

On the eve of the Disarmament Conference the United Nations Assembly carried, on November 23, 1961, by a large majority a resolution to ban the use of nuclear weapons as a violation of the United Nations Charter:

> That the use of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons is contrary to the spirit, letter and aims of the United Nations and, as such, a direct violation of the United Nations Charter. . . .
>
> That any State using nuclear or thermonuclear weapons is to be considered to violate the Charter of the United Nations, to act contrary to the law of humanity and to commit a crime against mankind and its civilisation.

This was carried by the United Nations Assembly by a majority of 55 to 20. The Soviet Union and the Socialist States were among the 55 voting for a ban on nuclear weapons. The United States, Britain, France and the Western powers were among the twenty voting against a ban on nuclear weapons. Let every nuclear disarmer note this alignment. It would be folly for nuclear disarmers to direct their fire equally upon those governments which are leading the fight for the banning of nuclear weapons and those which are opposing such a ban.

Professor Blackett's Analysis

Why did the Western powers, despite all their pious protestations on the platform, find themselves compelled, when it came to the hard showdown of a recorded vote, to register their minority vote against a ban on the use of nuclear weapons? Because acceptance would have meant the renunciation of their officially proclaimed

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nuclear strategy of 'Strike First'. On the other hand, the Soviet Union, although a nuclear power, could vote for such a ban, because the Soviet Union, also in accordance with its officially proclaimed strategy, only possesses nuclear weapons in order to hold in check and be capable of answering the Western aggressive nuclear threats, and therefore has always simultaneously led the fight for the banning and destruction of all nuclear weapons. Thus there is here a question of two differing strategic conceptions. It is here that Professor Blackett's analysis, in the *New Statesman* supplement of March 2, is of the greatest help to throw light on the problem. Basing himself, with his acknowledged authority in this field, on available information, mainly American, and including estimates of Soviet strength, he endeavours to measure the relative American and Soviet nuclear strength and the differing strategic conceptions involved. On this basis he is able to throw a flood of light on many of the current controversial questions, the conflicting claims of nuclear superiority, the question of tests and a test ban, of inspection and control and the other controversies which have bogged this issue of disarmament, and makes his own proposals for the path forward.

Two Strategic Conceptions

What does Blackett show? The general non-expert public have often been puzzled by the apparent conflict between U.S. claims of overwhelming nuclear superiority (indeed, the new Western tests have been justified by Kennedy and Macmillan, not on the grounds that the recent Soviet tests have overtaken the Western lead, but that there might be a danger of the lead becoming reduced), and the simultaneous claim of Marshal Malinovsky that the Soviet Union has the capacity to destroy every base of the Western powers in the event of Western nuclear aggression against the Soviet Union. Cartoonists and commentators have been satisfied to portray these claims as parallel 'rocket rattling'. Blackett clears up this question. He estimates that the United States has piled up a gigantic *quantitative* superiority in nuclear weapons, with a stockpile of around 30,000 megatons, that is: '30 times as great as would be required for the retaliatory blow described by Malinovsky'. On the other hand, the Soviet Union, having established *qualitative* superiority with the first inter-continental ballistic missiles, has not proceeded to build them up in quantity, as the American 'missile gap' scare anticipated. 'The Russians could have made many more than the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fifty or so I.C.B.M.'s with which they are now credited.' Instead, they have 'saved scarce industrial and technological resources which are valuable for their economic development'.

Aggressive and Defensive Strategy

Blackett distinguishes between two types of nuclear strategy. The first he calls the 'counter-force strategy' or 'in plain English, the capability for nuclear aggression'. This requires overwhelming quantitative superiority, 'a many-fold overall nuclear superiority over the enemy'. This is the strategy of the 'first strike'; 'the country that makes it must be the aggressor as regard strategic nuclear war'. In this context the significance of the Western powers' vote in the United Nations against a ban on the use of nuclear weapons becomes clear. The second strategy he describes as a 'retaliatory nuclear strategy', that is, the capacity to answer a nuclear aggression. This requires 'only a small nuclear delivery system', but 'the small delivery system must be highly invulnerable' to prevent destruction by 'a successful counter-force stroke', and this requires that the 'locations' of the 'small delivery system' must not be known.

> If the Washington figures for the Soviet nuclear strength are valid, it is clear that the U.S.S.R. has planned for a purely retaliatory nuclear rôle, and has definitely not planned for a surprise attack on the American delivery system. . . . The U.S.S.R. has clearly based its safety against the West's huge nuclear power on a few long-range missiles and aircraft operating from bases whose locations are kept as secret as possible.

Crucial Question of 'Inspection'

From this analysis it becomes at once clear why the crucial question of division between East and West in every official discussion of disarmament or a test ban becomes the question of 'inspection', so long as there is not general disarmament. Given general disarmament, the Soviet Union is willing to accept whatever system of inspection and control the West may desire. But until then, 'inspection' becomes the main objective of the aggressive strategy. The defensive strategy of the Soviet Union can only be successfully maintained provided the location of the very limited retaliatory system is kept secret. 'The obvious Soviet fear of inspection may well have been because they had so little to inspect.' On the other hand, for the aggressive strategy the discovery of the location of the retaliatory bases in order to seek to destroy them at the outset is vital. Hence the repeated U-2 aggressions. Hence the present orbiting by the United States of the secret Midas spy satellites (five

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

between November, 1961, and March, 1962) in violation of international agreements. Hence the refusal to accept any test ban unless accompanied by 'on-the-spot inspection' by foreign observers in the U.S.S.R., although all the scientists, including American scientists, have now agreed that observation by the existing machinery within each country is quite adequate for detecting all tests except possibly minute ones underground. Indeed, the universal recognition that tests can be detected without on-the-spot inspection, and that therefore this question is no longer an obstacle to signing a test ban treaty tomorrow if the Western powers would agree, has now led the United States to shift its ground and demand 'inspection' for any possible 'preparation' for a test ('no one at present has any idea how a requirement of this kind could be operated', *Daily Telegraph*, March 10, 1962)—thus showing that the real objective is not the test ban, but the 'inspection' which is the one indispensable prerequisite still lacking for carrying out the aggressive strategy.

The Anti-Missile Missile

Even more significant has been the Western reaction to the Soviet announcement that they have now solved the problem of the 'anti-missile missile' which will be capable of intercepting and rendering ineffective any nuclear attack. The innocent might have thought that this should be a cause for universal rejoicing if at last the means has really been found to ward off any nuclear attack, the menace of which has hung over the minds of humanity for a decade and a half. At last the hope arises that the defensive has once again overtaken the offensive. But the response from the side of the Western powers has been very different. The possibility of an 'anti-missile missile' fills them with alarm as a fatal obstacle to their plans. The new Western tests will be necessary, Premier Macmillan explained to the House of Commons on March 5, because the Soviet tests have resulted in 'significant advances in *defence* capability' which represent 'a potential threat to the deterrent power of the Western strategic armoury'. President Kennedy had explained even more plainly in his broadcast on March 2 that the new Western tests were necessary 'to add to our missiles certain penetration aids and decoys in order to render ineffective any anti-missile interceptor system'. The conception of the objective of the Western aggressive nuclear strategy to be capable of defeating the Soviet defensive nuclear strategy is here plainly stated.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Grounds for Confidence

Nevertheless, there are grounds for confidence, whatever the immediate difficulties of the Disarmament Conference and the still active war plans of the cold war advocates. Every advance in Soviet science and technology strengthens the forces on the side of peace. We have seen how the Soviet breaking of the Western nuclear monopoly awoke Russell from his dreams of a preventive atomic war on the Soviet Union and opened the way to the broad campaign for nuclear disarmament. Now the development of the anti-missile missile is bringing within view the hope that it may become strategically possible to hold off a nuclear attack, and thus win time for us to advance to better solutions. But we cannot look passively to the advance of Soviet science and technology to save us from nuclear war. No technical answer alone can solve the political problem. The dangers are still grave so long as the open advocates of aggression are still active in Bonn and the Pentagon. But the aggressive strategy of the cold war advocates need not conquer. They have had to retreat before, and they will have to retreat again. What is needed is the united action of the peoples of the entire world to defeat the menace of nuclear war and win the battle for general and complete disarmament.

March 17, 1962. R.P.D.

FORTY YEARS AGO

(Despite all the howls of the imperialist press, with predictions that Nehru's Congress Party would go down and the Communist Party of India would be wiped out, they were bitterly disappointed when the results were known. The Congress Party retained power; left-wing members strengthened their position and the Communist Party increased its percentage of the vote.

It is timely to recall that forty years ago this month, Labour Monthly *printed this statement of Mahatma Gandhi's views of Britain and Indian Home Rule. The British Government of the day had just arrested Gandhi.)*

Napoleon is said to have described the English as a nation of shopkeepers. It is a fitting description. They hold whatever dominions they have for the sake of their commerce. Their army and their navy are intended to protect it. When the Transvaal offered no such attractions, the late Mr. Gladstone discovered that it was not right for the English to hold it. When it became a paying proposition, resistance led to war. . . . It is related that someone asked the late President Kruger whether there was gold in the moon? He replied that it was highly unlikely, because, if there were, the English would have annexed it.

(From *Labour Monthly*, April, 1922. 'Britain, India and Swaraj'.)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT: FORWARD FROM ALDERMASTON

The Reverend Canon L. John Collins

[*Following contributions in our columns on the subject of Nuclear Disarmament by Professor J. D. Bernal, F.R.S. ('Faith in Man's Future', January) and by Bertrand Russell, O.M., F.R.S. ('What I Think', March), Canon Collins writes on the significance of this year's Aldermaston March.—Ed.*, L.M.]

THE Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament has already in four years achieved a considerable measure of success. Up to the beginning of 1958 the British people were apathetic about what was being done in their name in matters of defence: Mr. Attlee, now Earl Attlee, was able, for example, to saddle Britain with its own so-called 'deterrent' without having to consult the country and without protest; just a passing statement in Parliament, as though the decision to make A-bombs was of no greater significance than, say, a decision to put the military in more comfortable uniforms. But as a result of the Campaign there is no longer such apathy. And with the 'capture' of the Labour Party Conference of 1960 for unilateral nuclear disarmament it began to look as though such a policy could be a political reality within a few years.

Optimism in political matters is, as a rule, folly. Seldom has this been better shown than in what happened after Scarborough. The insistence of Mr. Gaitskell and others in the leadership of the Labour Party upon a defence policy which to many of us seems hardly to differ from the defence policy of the Tory Party, and their consequent refusal to be loyal to the Party Conference decision caught the Campaign napping. (And how thin were the excuses for such disloyalty; particularly hypocritical was the 'attack' upon the Scarborough decision on the ground that it had been brought about by trade union block votes, an 'attack' not launched against the decision on defence in 1959 and in 1961, nor against the marginal decision on German rearmament.) We had achieved a surprise marginal victory, and were neither strong enough to consolidate it, nor wise enough to realise in time the need to work 'flat out' to increase our influence within the unions. Instead, we assumed too readily the battle won, and we limited our effectiveness by internal battles over the question of civil disobedience.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But pessimism is just as foolish as optimism. Looked at sensibly the Blackpool reversal of the Scarborough vote was no bad thing for the Campaign. It has driven us to think again, and more deeply, about our aims and the methods by which we hope to achieve them. And the proof of the pudding is in the eating. Despite Blackpool, we are now nearer than ever before to victory: we have achieved much greater unity within the movement; more and more of the rank and file of the unions are turning in our direction, more and more of the constituency parties are with us; Liberals increasingly support us and many Conservatives are far less hostile; the sale of our literature and badges has risen rapidly and consistently during the last six months, and more than ever before we are persuading people that the policies we advocate are not only morally right but also politically sensible.

This year's Aldermaston March, if we are to ensure its success, can be the turning point in our Campaign. Britain will not get rid of nuclear bombs, nuclear bases, and nuclear alliances till a British government takes a political decision to do so. And, so long as we do not despair of British democracy, this means that we must persuade enough of the British people to insist that such a government is returned to power. Whatever value there may be in other methods of persuasion, there can be little doubt of the value there would be in a stupendously successful Aldermaston demonstration this year.

The Campaign is, and always has been non-party. That it 'set its cap' at the Labour Party was a tactical decision even if an unwise one (and I personally do not think it was). It certainly was not intended to suggest that we wished to tie ourselves to any one political party. On the contrary, we welcome as supporters all who genuinely desire peace, and who, to that end, wish to see Britain give a lead towards multilateral disarmament by herself opting out of the nuclear club; all who wish to see both sides of the cold war making positive contributions towards peace; pacifists, non-pacifists, members of this or that political party or of none; Christians, non-Christians; all are welcome within the Campaign, so long as they genuinely seek to further its aims and are not concerned to use it for some other purpose.

I appeal, therefore, to any supporters who can possibly do so to join the Aldermaston March this Easter. It is essential that we show the political leaders that a vast and growing body of British people is in favour of our policy—political leaders cannot, except

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in a dictatorship, possibly ignore a growing expression of opinion. Not only so; a massive Easter demonstration will be an enormous encouragement to those many growing movements against the use of nuclear power for military purposes which are springing up all over the world. To all who have 'done' an Aldermaston before I say 'come again and bring others with you'; to youth I say 'come, and bring your mum and dad'. We must not be content unless we have so many on Easter Monday that traffic in London is brought to a standstill.

AN EASTER OFFERING, 1922

ONCE again the Soviet Union's call for general and complete disarmament sends the Western leaders into a flurry of back-stair talks and manœuvres to cover up. And so it is interesting to recall the consternation caused in 1922 by a similar call for total disarmament by the Soviet Union, as shown in the cartoon we print on the next page, where the traditional Russian Easter Egg, labelled 'Total Disarmament' is offered to an appalled Western leader.

This 'Easter Egg' was offered by George Chicherin, People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs, at the opening of the International Economic Conference at Genoa on April 10, 1922, to which the Allied Powers had invited Russia. The Allied Powers had hoped to use this Conference as a means of penetrating the Soviet Union in the hope of destroying it, as was pointed out by Chicherin in a speech printed in the *Labour Monthly* the month prior to the Conference. But the Soviet Union took the opportunity of making a great initiative for peace. George Chicherin said: 'To meet the needs of world economy and the development of universal productive forces, the Russian Government is willing deliberately and voluntarily to open its frontiers for the creation of international transit routes, it is ready to open up millions of acres of the most fertile land in the world to cultivation, it is ready to grant forest concessions, coal and mineral concessions of infinite wealth, chiefly in Siberia, and concessions of all kinds throughout the territory of Soviet Russia. It is projecting co-operation, between western industry on the one side and the agriculture and industry of Russia and Siberia on the other, of a kind which will enlarge the base for European industry as regards raw materials, grain and fuel, on a scale by far exceeding the pre-war level. . . . The Russian Dele-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gation intends to propose, in the course of the Conference, the general limitation of armaments and support all proposals tending to lighten the burden of militarism, on condition that this limitation applies to the armies of all countries, and that the rules of war are supplemented by the absolute prohibition of its most barbarous

forms such as asphyxiating gases, aerial warfare and others, as well as the use of means of destruction against the peaceful civilian population'.

But the Western leaders rejected that offer.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

GENEVA, 1962

Quaestor

THE Disarmament Conference opened at Geneva (with France abstaining) on March 14. Once again the capitalist press immediately began to confuse the minds of the people. 'Russia threatens peace talks' (*Daily Herald*): 'Niet to West H-Plan' (*Daily Express*): 'Russia rejects concessions by West' (*The Times*): 'A western attempt to get Russia to talk sense . . . ended in Geneva tonight in complete failure' (*Daily Telegraph*)—this was the doleful and perfidious burden of the newspapers on March 16.

Before looking at what happened the previous day to produce such a verdict, recall the recent history of the question.

At the September, 1958, General Assembly of the United Nations the U.S.S.R. tabled a memorandum calling for

(1) Reduction of Soviet and American armed forces, first to 1,700,000 each, later to one to one-and-a-half millions, and others proportionately.

(2) A 15 per cent cut in arms budgets by the Great Powers, exchanging lists of the armaments to be reduced.

(3) Prohibition of atomic and hydrogen weapons, with, as first steps, (*a*) renunciation of their use by the present owners, (*b*) no transfer to other states, and (*c*) a nuclear-free zone in Europe.

(4) Renunciation of nuclear tests.

(5) Prohibition of the use of outer space for military purposes, international co-operation in peaceful space research and closing of foreign bases in other countries' territory.

(6) International control measures to prevent surprise attacks (at rail junctions, large ports, highways, with air inspection) for 500 miles on either side of the east-west border in Europe.

(7) One third reduction of foreign troops in both Germanies, and agreed cuts of Great-Power forces in other Nato and Warsaw Pact countries.

(8) A legal ban on war propaganda.

These proposals were ridiculed and rejected by the Western powers. However, an atmosphere of hopefulness was created by Macmillan's visit to Moscow (for election purposes) in February-March, 1959, and by President Eisenhower's agreement, a few months later, to an exchange of visits with Premier Khrushchov. Accordingly, during the latter's visit to the U.S.A. that year, he tabled at the General Assembly on September 18 a detailed programme for complete disarmament in four years:

In the first stage, points one and two of the 1958 plan to be applied. In the second stage, all remaining forces to go, all bases in others' territory

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to be closed, and the troops concerned to be disbanded. In the third stage, all nuclear weapons to be prohibited and those existing to be destroyed, as should all air forces. Scientific research for war purposes, military training and service, 'defence' estimates, general staffs and War Offices to be forbidden.

As transitional steps promoting these objectives, points 3(*c*), 6 and 7 of the 1958 proposals to be applied, together with a non-aggression pact between the Nato and Warsaw Pact countries. At all stages there should be appropriate international supervision.

These proposals made a deep impression—and it became still deeper when the Soviet Union, on January 15, 1960, announced a unilateral cut of 33 per cent (nearly 1,250,000) in its armed forces, and offered to sign a treaty with the Western powers banning all nuclear tests. The offer was declined.

Nevertheless, at the Disarmament Committee which met in Geneva from March 15 to April 12, 1960, the five Socialist States represented put up a timetable for the programme—stage 1 to take effect (and to include China) within 12 to 18 months : stage 2, another 18 to 24 months: and stage 3 to be completed within another 12 months.

The counter-plan of the Western powers provided for no cuts in weapons or men during an unstated period : storage of weapons, both conventional and nuclear, during another unstated period (not their destruction or banning) : ending of the production of fissionable material 'for war purposes' (but not of nuclear weapons from existing stocks) for another indefinite period: an immense number of 'studies', 'collection of information', etc., in the meantime—and, one day, after a disarmament conference, the prohibition of nuclear weapons and the reduction of armaments and forces.

So obviously was this a plan for continuing the arms race indefinitely, under cover of talk about disarming, that when, on June 27, 1960, the Western powers tabled their scheme in more precise terms, the British press never ventured to publish it (nor has to this day, except for a summary 'leaked' in *The Times* on June 29, 1960).

But by then a bigger and more criminal blow at disarmament had been struck by the American Government, one in which it was heartily backed by the British Government—the U-2 spy flight over Soviet territory (May 1), at the very time when Eisenhower, all smiles, was preparing to come to a long-awaited summit conference in Paris. Not only was that meeting wrecked thereby, but so was the Disarmament Committee.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

All the same, the U.S.S.R. on September 23 that year submitted redrafted proposals to the United Nations Assembly, to meet Western criticisms. They brought into the first stage the destruction, under international supervision, of *the means of delivering nuclear weapons*—missiles, rockets, aircraft, surface ships and submarines, artillery—which the French Government had been demanding; as well as joint study of measures for stopping manufacture and destroying stocks of nuclear, biological and chemical weapons themselves, under obligation to report to the United Nations. This time the British newspapers mostly avoided telling their readers about the Soviet plan in detail at all: and the Western powers countered it only by producing a vague and general summary of their previous 'plan'—no immediate cuts in arms and armies, no date for disarmament, immense concentration on all kinds of schemes for 'controls'.

From then onwards, for nearly twelve months, there was a period of open piling up of armaments (including nuclear tests by the French Government) and war threats by the Western powers. The Soviet Budget for 1961 provided for a substantial cut in defence expenditure—so the British, American, French and West German war budgets for 1961 were all substantially increased. The Soviet Union offered a peaceful settlement of the West Berlin question—so the Western powers began shouting about a 'mortal peril to the freedom of Berliners', sent more troops to West Germany and began to rattle the sabre in every way possible. War was 'in the air' in July, 1961. Then the Soviet Government took determined steps itself. It stopped demobilisation, and in August it restarted nuclear tests—on the principle that the danger to mankind from 'fall-out' was less at the time than the danger from falling nuclear bombs (though, after all the subsequent howling, the Western governments have admitted that fall-out was far less than usual, and that the tests were not so 'wanton' and 'senseless' after all, since they had proved the Soviet Union was able to *defend* itself by destroying hostile missiles).

In fact, the Soviet decision calmed down a lot of the hotheads. It has made possible, in the upshot—after nearly two years of wanton interruption by the Pentagon and War Office braggarts—the resumption of disarmament discussions at Geneva.

What are the prospects, in the light of this record? Not very bright. The proceedings began with a ritual attempt by the Western powers to secure a separate test-ban treaty with international in-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

spection. They themselves, in a Macmillan-Kennedy message on September 3, 1961, admitted that the perfected means of detection now available made it unnecessary, for practical purposes, to have mutual inspection on one another's territory, so far as tests in the atmosphere were concerned. The Soviet Union on November 27 responded with an offer to sign a treaty banning *all* tests on this basis, pointing out that outer-space and under-sea tests were equally detectable, and that the signatories could agree to refrain from underground tests (in any case limited in importance), pending further research. But after the revelation of their preparations for aggression earlier in the year, the U.S.S.R. would no longer agree to admit their inspection teams to its territory for *nuclear supervision alone*. Nuclear tests could no longer be treated as a distinct question from that of complete and general disarmament. Agree on *that*—and any 'controls' the West could suggest would be acceptable. But without a disarmament agreement, nuclear *'inspectors'* could, and probably would, become armaments *spies*.

This was the position the Soviet Government took up at Geneva in March, 1962. Did the Western powers know it would? Of course they did. Why did they raise the question, then, at a conference admittedly due to discuss general and complete disarmament? Merely in order to give the press a chance to poison the atmosphere.

As regards disarmament itself, only the first press reports of the two plans advanced on March 15 are to hand, at the time of writing.

The U.S.S.R. submitted a full draft treaty of 48 articles, based on previous proposals carried somewhat further.

As against this, the U.S. plan, backed by the British, means the retention of nuclear power, and the maximum possibilities of legalised espionage, with the least possible concessions which might seriously weaken the fancied superiority of the U.S.A.

There the matter stood, when these lines were being written. After the experience of the last four years, it is obvious that only the greatest possible pressure by the people directly on the Government —and on its 'me-too' sham critics sitting on the Labour front bench —can bring about a real disarmament agreement at this time, when the war danger is more apparent and more horrible to contemplate than at any other time in history.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Problems of Trade Unionism in the Sixties

THE AIM BEHIND THE PLANNING COUNCIL

John Newton

[*Mr. John Newton has been on the General Council of the Trades Union Congress since 1953, being General Secretary of the 116,000-strong Tailors and Garment Workers, the largest affiliated union in 'Group 11' (Clothing). He is the third member of the General Council to discuss in our pages this year the Government's so-called 'Development' or 'Planning' Council. The present article follows 'The T.U.C. and Planning' by Robert Willis (London Typographical Society) and 'Wages and the Planning Council' by E. J. Hill (Boilermakers) in February and March respectively.—Ed.*, L.M.]

THE establishment of the National Economic Development Council shows, whichever way one looks at it, that the Government has reached a stage of political aberration, which is dangerous in a political party devoted to the principles of the *status quo*. The Conservative Party is the party of the Establishment. Since this is so, the introduction of the National Economic Development Council ('Ned') can be regarded either as a politically unexpected phenomenon or as the sudden eruption of the latent pre-war forces in the party, which were comparatively dormant until July last year. There are, of course, other considerations to take into account. It may well be that the Government has decided to take a chance on bursting the drum with which it created its stupendous and colossal ballyhoo at the last election. The reasons for this may not be difficult to find.

With the post-war development of such organisations as O.E.E.C., G.A.T.T. and the United Nations, the statistical improvements in the various countries, the comparative industrial and economic performances of the industrially developed nations can be much better ascertained. In comparison with Russia, Western Germany and recently France and some other countries, the economic performance of Britain leaves a great deal to be desired. The main responsibility for this British position rests clearly with the British Government, as a consequence of its policies over the past ten years. Indeed, it is now apparent that the 'Never-had-it-so-good' and the 'free-for-all'

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ballyhoo were amongst the most wilful acts of political deception ever perpetrated on the British public.

The Government ran the country as if it was playing a game of poker, until finally after wagering the last £83 million, it had to borrow itself out of its self-imposed financial crisis at the end of the first half of last year. The pay pause and 'Development Council' and even entry into the Common Market may have been the collateral demanded by the International Monetary Fund. It is now very plain that somebody must pay the gambling debts of the Tory Government. The Government's White Paper on incomes shows quite plainly who they intend that shall be. 'Neddy' may be the donkey they intend to flog for this purpose. The General Council of the Trades Union Congress decided to participate in the 'Development Council', but it must be said that entry into it was no trade union capitulation. The written terms of entry were somewhat onerous and described as insulting by a leading Tory newspaper.

But the fact of the matter is this, the Tories have now their backs to the wall. Their traditional 'gunboat' attitude still breaks out from time to time. The pay pause displays another of their underlying idiosyncrasies. When they are in difficulty, or imagine themselves to be in difficulty, they revert to their traditional rôle. We saw that at the time of Suez. We are seeing it today with the pay pause. We shall see it tomorrow with the Common Market. Indeed, since the Rome Treaty talks of harmonisation of labour legislation and working conditions, and the law as to trade unions and collective bargaining and collaboration between the member states on these matters, there is some reason to believe, taking this into account and the strenuous efforts now being made by the government to enter the Common Market, that the Immigration Bill, the pay pause and the 'Development Council' show the way the government is going. Since the government is a Tory Government these developments must be seen in the light of Tory Party conventional policy, and judgment of the issues must be based on that fact.

Outside this context, however, the planning proposals for the National Economic Development Council are, at the present time, somewhat obscure. There are generalisations about the gross national product and economic growth, and the definite postulations on wage restraint. Much of this has been inspired by such organisations as Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development and we can only assume what is likely to be accepted from the 'Development Council' by examining the government's present

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

policies. It is hardly likely that it would accept findings contrary to its already declared policies. If it did so it would be accepting a serious political disadvantage. Indeed, the authority and structure of the 'Development Council' must be such that the government can disregard recommendations inimical to its political and economic disposition. That means surely that it must disregard much of what the T.U.C. representatives are likely to put forward, however much they may be in the present-day economic framework. Indeed, the government has already rejected the economic opinions of the General Council, which is their chief complaint.

It seems that either the government is depending upon a similarity of outlook of the other members of the 'Development Council', or that it is prepared to repudiate its previous repudiations, and one must assume that it is extremely unlikely to do that. The way it has been introduced and the circumstances in which it has been introduced, cast grave doubts on the intentions of the government. It is either nothing more than a political expedient, or it is the thatch which will divert some of the heat which will be generated by the change from 'Tory freedom' to 'Tory planning'. The thatch, however, may catch fire. It is certain that it would not have been introduced if its sponsors had seen any political disadvantage in it; for Tory politicians are politicians foremost and hindmost.

Where a particular committee of this description has been set up, the responsible government has been very much of a guiding light, and as a consequence of the different interests represented, and the necessity to arrive at some decision, compromise has generally been the rule. In practice none of these interests will compromise to the extent of being compromised. The odds, therefore, are that the Council will suffer the fate of its French counterpart, and merely become a façade for the activities of the permanent staff. It may develop into nothing but a 'Deckmantel' for the future measures which the government will find necessary as a result of its past economic policies, or by entry into the Common Market, or both.

The truth of the matter is that as a nation, we are throwing too much money down the drain. The government itself is the main inflationary medium. The arms bill has gone up to £1,700 million a year. Fiscal and monetary changes in July raised the Retail Price Index substantially last year. Productive employment is being reduced, whilst non-productive employment increases. There is no solution to these problems on the basis of market economics and defensive measures which we cannot and never could afford.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The belief in the mechanism of the market is fundamental to Tory Party political and economic thinking. Planning to them is the manipulation of the market, including the labour market, and hence wages; and this is what it is all about.

We shall hear a great deal more in the future of generalisations about the gross natural product. We shall also hear a great deal about production, with little regard to those who actually do the producing. The statisticians will enlarge and multiply their admonishing graphs. The pound will be worshipped as never before, and the threat of devaluation will quietly and insidiously be drawn into the sub-conscious of the unwary.

The post-war period since 1945 gave the majority of workers a sense of security and independence never known since the beginning of the industrial revolution, but the next two or three years will destroy many cherished illusions, which those of us who lived in the pre-war Tory paradise never had. We shall see!

A SHOUT FROM THE PEOPLE

[*The Government's three-pronged offensive—the 'pay-pause', the attack on nationalised industries through pit closures and railway cuts and the attempt to get a stranglehold on trade union policy through the National Economic Development Council—is arousing very sharp reactions. Amongst the latest are equally the rout of Government candidates in the by-elections and the big response to the one-day strikes and strike ballot by the engineering workers. But in some cases a rift has been apparent between rank and file and certain trade union leaders whose opposition to the Government manœuvres has seemed less than whole-hearted, to put it no stronger. Yet where the looked-for lead has been given a remarkable response has come from the members: a real shout has gone up from the people.*

A particularly good example of a principled fight, with features which workers in all industries will find useful, can be seen in the events leading up to the Parliamentary mass lobby by Scottish miners against pit closures, fully supported by their Area Executive, on March 8, 1962. Only the outbreak of smallpox in Wales at the last moment prevented it from being a joint mass lobby from the two main coalfields most affected by the Government's policy of pit closures. In Scotland and Wales, as in Kent, a campaign has been

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

conducted rejecting the theory of 'uneconomic' pits—or 'uneconomic' coalfields or an 'uneconomic' industry, for that matter—and the inevitability of closing them. Below we print the views of four Scottish miners who took part in the lobby; a District Secretary, an Executive member of the Scottish Labour Party, a Labour Party County Councillor and a pit delegate.—Ed., L.M.]

GUY STOBBS, Ayrshire; District Secretary, Scottish Area, National Union of Mineworkers:

The Scottish Miners' lobby was an important stage in the campaign initiated by the Scottish Miners' Executive Committee and widely supported by many sections of the Scottish people. The campaign came into being as a result of the very sharp reaction of the Executive Committee to the proposed closure of sixteen pits in the Scottish Coalfield during 1962. The Divisional Coal Board announcement followed 'leakages' in the press as to their intentions even before the Scottish miners' leaders were informed. The Scottish Executive immediately decided to condemn the manner in which the news was leaked to the Press and the Board for failing to consult the miners. We decided, too, to refuse to co-operate in closing so-called 'uneconomic' pits; to insist on the fullest consultation in accordance with our rights within the industry; and finally, to demand a public inquiry into the administration, financial planning and mechanisation policies of the Scottish Divisional Coal Board. We considered that we had ample evidence from official documents and from our own information to justify our demand for a public inquiry.

We issued a press statement along these lines which evoked an immediate sympathetic response throughout Scotland. The Presbytery of Ayr was first 'on the ball' and the next day, on November 7, declared its support for a public inquiry; within the next five weeks over thirty organisations, representing Co-operative Societies, local authorities, Church organisations, the General Council of the Scottish Trades Union Congress and the Scottish Council of the Labour Party went on record declaring support for the Scottish miners' fight against pit closures.

Meanwhile a mass public campaign was being conducted in the Scottish coalfield by the miners' union—and contact was made with Scottish Members of Parliament and with the National Executive Committee of the British National Union of Mineworkers. The Scottish M.P.s after hearing our case presented by Alex Moffat, our

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

President, and John Wood, our Secretary, declared support in principle; but because the British Miners' Executive rejected our call for a public inquiry, they were not prepared to risk a cleavage with their English colleagues. In rejecting the Scottish Area's call, the British Miners' Executive instructed the Scottish E.C. to deal with the matter within the consultative machinery in the industry; we have loyally carried out this policy and have had several discussions with the Divisional Coal Board and their officials. But at the same time we have been pressing our demand for a public inquiry, as we contend that it is the Annual National Conference, not the National Executive Committee which is the highest authority in our organisation. The recent decision of the Yorkshire Area to support our call for a public inquiry may lay the basis for the National Conference in July agreeing to this proposal. At the same time, we got the active support of the craftsmen, the clerical workers and others; and the extremely successful Conference on Scottish Economy convened by the Scottish Trades Union Congress in Glasgow, on February 18, attended by 1,500 delegates, was arranged largely as a result of the N.U.M. Scottish Area's approaches; we have had the active participation of railwaymen, engineers, members of local authorities, churches, traders' organisations, M.P.s, etc., in our public meetings, all pledging support for our campaign and for the mass lobby.

This, then was the background to our campaign for the lobby by what must be one of the most representative Scottish delegations ever to cross the border. Over 700 travelled by special train, many went by private arrangement and we were joined by hundreds in London, after two extremely successful 'send-off' meetings and marches in Glasgow and Edinburgh. In London we marched along busy streets—hailed by many passers-by with enthusiasm—1,500-strong with banners and posters proclaiming our demands. We lobbied our M.P.s, finding the Labour men in the main sympathetic, the Conservatives less so but with some notable exceptions. Our officials met Mr. Richard Wood, Minister of Power, and Mr. Hugh Gaitskell, Leader of the Labour Party, and a mass meeting was held at Westminster to hear their report back. Most of the delegates who had travelled down and many who had joined us in London attended this enthusiastic, spirited meeting.

And now? The lobby is not the end of our campaign but the culmination of a stage. We are now engaged in the widest possible series of report-back meetings, at which we must make it clear that our fight for a reversal of the policy of pit closures is an integral part

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the fight to preserve Scotland's economy, industry and employment, the fight for our very existence.

The Scottish Trades Union Congress this month at Aberdeen will concern itself with these problems; all major cities, towns and villages in Scotland must be made aware of the problems and what we consider are the solutions. Deputations to M.P.s to Government Departments, to the Secretary of State for Scotland must all be undertaken before the N.U.M. National Conference in July.

The Coal Board can announce their intention to close the model Rothes pit; but if sufficient pressure is maintained, if unity in our ranks is maintained, we shall put the Tory Government out of office and replace it with a Government that will pursue a policy of peace and socialism, and the vast expansion of Britain's key industries.

PETER McQUADE, Midlothian, Executive Committee, Scottish Area, National Union of Mineworkers; Executive Committee, Scottish Labour Party:

THERE were compelling reasons why we came to London to Lobby. The first factor is the danger of unemployment; there was no doubt of that after what Lord Robens had to say when he met us last month. It made us the more determined. This government is not in the least concerned at the prospect of unemployment for the miners. As a trade union we cannot allow much a government policy to destroy one of our most important resources—one that the country's economy is built upon. Yet that is what these pit closures can but do. The second factor—and it is a very disturbing feature—is the effect on the whole Scottish economy. We demonstrated not only for the miners, but in the interests of the general public, giving a lead. That can be seen by the fact that Railwaymen came with us, representatives from public bodies and even from Church organisations. What we believe should be done—and what we demand is the direction of industry to Scotland; and when we say direction, we mean it, not merely leaving it to 'voluntary principle' that employers should open up only if and when and where they think they can take most profit out of Scotland. We came down to meet with Hugh Gaitskell and tell him that he has got to take up this question of the direction of industry to Scotland through the Parliamentary Labour Party.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WILLIE ANDERSON, East Lothian, County Councillor; Chairman, Ormiston Branch, National Union of Mineworkers:

As a county councillor I am especially concerned because there are only two pits left in the county and they are now trying to close one of them. The reason given? Their first explanation was that fishers were complaining that there was a seepage from the pit which was causing pollution of the River Tyne. Next when we took it up with them they dropped that reason and claimed instead that Ormiston Pit was 'uneconomic'. They don't seem able to make up their minds which reason, or excuse, to rely on. But the truth is that by any standard this pit is fully economic. There are few other costs, all sales being pithead sales; and there is at least ten years economic life in the pit which employs 150 men. Look at the social question side. These two are the last out of six pits. There has been no attempt whatever to get alternative industry for the area. The Tory member of parliament, Sir William Anstruther-Gray, has done nothing about it. If the colliery closes there is no other work at all locally. The public throughout Britain ought to know the facts. A lobby like ours is an important way of informing the public. Does a lobby 'do any good'? Of course it does. Look at the last time the Scots and Welsh Miners lobbied in February, 1959. That stopped many closures, delayed others, saved the jobs of at least 1,200 miners and got the social questions attended to. Today this lobby can stop closures too. Much can be done if you put a bit of heart and fight into people. The lobby opened the eyes of the public. Another step which would help would be a Public Inquiry into the Scottish Area of the Coal Board. If the public could only know the waste that goes on! Enough could be saved by only cutting out the waste to prevent pits from being 'uneconomic' and to do away with the argument that they need to be closed for 'economic' reasons.

ALEC WILSON, Lanarkshire, pit delegate, Kingshill No. 2 Branch:

The lobby of Miners and Railwaymen from Scotland was a necessity. It had to be made clear that we in Scotland will not submit to political bias against our Area. We will not accept the vicious Tory government policy of promoting the oil interests against coal, nor permitting methane gas imports to undermine coal. We will not accept closures of pits and railway branch lines on so-called 'economic' grounds. Workers today are not prepared any longer to accept meekly as an 'economic necessity' that they must shift and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sell up their homes and shift once again, from pits in one county to another, let alone across the border. Scottish miners and railwaymen will not accept as inevitable the continued 'drift' from Scotland, a twentieth century version on the grand scale of the 'Sutherland Clearances' of a century and a half ago. We are not helpless peasants or single crofter families, but a powerful organised working class body. We demand that there must be a national fuel policy giving coal its due. There must be planning of industry: where coal reserves are exhausted there must be government direction of industry to provide alternative work, with no sackings until it is found. There must be a public inquiry into the administration, planning and mechanisation plan of the Scottish Division of the National Coal Board. Again we shall resist attacks, from whatever quarter they come, aimed at breaking the militancy of our Scottish Trade Unions. The lobby was an answer to that, when members of the National Union of Mineworkers, the National Union of Railwaymen and the Associated Society of Locomotive Engineers and Firemen all marched together in unity. More of that same unity would soon give us at long last a socialist administration under which there could really be a proper planned economy, which is the only way to save this country and its people. There can be no final solution, in my opinion, until industrial action is linked with political action to throw out this anti-working class government, of private interests, and replace it with one which will owe allegiance to the public interest, to the vast majority, the working people.

(Composed by a miner during an historic struggle in Wales a generation ago to the tune of 'Just before the battle, mother')

A South Wales Lock-out

We are Colliers from the Rhondda,
Locked out of work at Clydach Vale,
And it will surely make you wonder
When you've listened to our tale.
Since we had the new agreement
Old customs they have tried to steal,
And though they had us at their mercy,
They have never made us squeal.

When they introduced conveyors
Half our wages then they stole,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Now they say the Pits aren't paying,
And they have thrown us on the dole;
Let the story of this outrage
Ring out over land and seas,
And may the kind South Wales Coalowner
Know the want of bread and cheese.

Our kids are practically naked
Since the Strike three years ago,
And with slack time and slump in wages
We have never had a show;
What care they with all their millions
In Guest, Keen, and Nettlefold,
While we starve with unemployment
They are saving up their gold.

We have fathers, mothers, sisters,
Now in need this very day,
O kind friends if you will help us
God above will surely pay.

THE 'BLINDFOLDED GIANTS'

Henry Purcell

THE chairman of Imperial Chemical Industries, Mr. Paul Chambers, recently said of modern industrial concerns: 'We must do something better than present a spectacle of blindfolded giants blundering about all over the place'. He has now succeeded in his effort to expand the power of I.C.I., in making Siamese twins of two such giants, leaving I.C.I. with a 35 to 40 per cent holding in Courtaulds. The two companies which already had a joint subsidiary in British Nylon Spinners, are, for the United Kingdom at least, considerable giants (though as a result of the revelations made, the public at least is less 'blindfolded' about them than it was.). The capital employed in I.C.I. at its latest balance sheet was £587 million and in Courtaulds £167 million. Together, according to Mr. Douglas Jay, M.P., they employ 170,000 workers, which is roughly one in fifty of all employed in manufacturing in the U.K. Both have branched into other industries, following the flow of the modern chemical products they handle, and they have important subsidiaries overseas, particularly in Common Market countries and, according to the late managing director of Fisons, the network of international agreements is being formed again. They handle advanced productive techniques. The net output per worker employed for chemicals

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as a whole is four-fifths and, in some branches, double, what it is for manufacturing as a whole.

The significance of the effort made by I.C.I. to integrate with Courtaulds should not be lost sight of. It is the one which gets away that lingers in the memory! The problem that it was designed to solve remains, either to be dealt with by the big trusts or by the labour movement.

Imperial Chemical Industries Limited has always had a fascination for the left. Its glamour has besprinkled discussion on its bid to take over Courtaulds. The attraction arises from the pomposity of its public appearance and the secrecy surrounding its curious processes of manufacture, for war as well as for peace, and its 'science fiction' products. The social and, by implication, the political claims it has made have distinguished it as *the* modern capitalist trust. Its original founder was the creator of 'Mondism' and his successor was prominent in the Economic League. The shock of the public rows and the accusations of inefficiency thrown about, many of them unanswered, is of the same character as that when we discover what it was our parents really did. It is no accident that the present drive by I.C.I. for more integration comes just as Selwyn Lloyd's super-Mondist 'Neddy' is led from her stable.

It is no accident, because I.C.I. as exemplar of capital in the modern age is facing more acutely than most the dilemma of capitalism: in an age of social production the machine cannot work with private ownership of property. Engels, when he pointed this dilemma out, was living in what we can call the second period of the industrial revolution, *i.e.*, the generalisation of machine using, export of plant and the post railway age. Now we are in the third period: of machines working machines, of man-made raw materials substituted for nature's materials. And in this period there is also the growth and challenge of socialism in practice. I.C.I. with its other chemical rivals is in the forefront of this development.

It can be said that I.C.I. is fighting like Courtaulds or any capitalist, for profits, ultimately for its shareholders. Profits of I.C.I. in 1960, were two and four-fifths above the level of ten years before. The resources available or 'capital employed' by I.C.I. has more than doubled in the last ten years. But the threat that is over the directors is whether profits will increase as fast as investment in plant: with surplus output capacity put up by themselves and competitors this is in doubt. Indeed the relationship between investment and profit may turn downwards. The real fight is not for

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dividends (which anyway are over five times what they were ten years ago and amount to only a sixth of the profits) but to deal with the surplus capacity, of which the falling rate of profit is a warning. It is the philosophy of private enterprise organising in larger and larger groupings—the false shadow of socialism—which is the objective of the exercise. It is technical changes and the demands they make on brains and cash, that are the root of the demand for 'rationalisation' as it used to be called, 'integration' as it is now called. Economically the objective is to get more surplus value from less workers—cutting less efficient 'surplus' plant and manpower.

The political side of the matter is that the workers—wage earners, salary earners, operatives and scientists—shall be persuaded to accept the social order which allows I.C.I. to be privately owned and more 'productive'. 'Stinks' and social soapery go together, because 'stinks', the chemical industry, should, to be effective economically, be the basis of socialism, and this the capitalists know.

The parallel between the arguments used by the founder of I.C.I. thirty-five years ago and the present chairman for the extension of its power now, shows that the same problem was being faced when I.C.I. was formed. The memorandum submitted by the Association of British Chemical Manufacturers to the International Economic Conference held in 1927 remarked of sulphuric acid that

> The productive capacity of most of the leading industrial countries is very materially in excess of the countries' demands. . . . But a solution can be found for the difficulties which have arisen, and will probably be found along the lines of international agreements concluded between the individual national industries when they have sufficiently amalgamated their own interests.

In those days coal was 'the final cheap raw material' and the 'solution' came after the defeat of the British miners in 1926 (and of the Ruhr miners in 1924). It was the merger of Nobel Industries, Brunnes Mond, United Alkali and British Dyestuffs and a number of smaller firms soon joined. The capital at the end of the first year was £58 million. Mond was the leader (Lord Melchett as he had by then become). The U.K. industry had gained by the absorption of a good deal of German 'know-how' after the end of world war one. But Mond believed in mergers.

> Naturally a company of our magnitude and our history has very important relations, both on the continent and in America, with important industrialists carrying on similar and allied operations.

There was the Solvay Company of Belgium, the Allied Chemical

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Company of America, Du Pont and General Motors (these last two are being forced by United States courts to break the share connection between them). There was Sir Harry McGowan of Canadian Industries, who was to take over Mond's rôle and extend the practice of international agreements and who was President until a few years ago. There was South Africa, Australia, Japan, Eastern Europe—and the Internessen Gemeinschaft. Courtaulds, in those days with a capital of £32 million was in artificial silk and owned American Viscose (its sale was to be a condition of Lease Lend in 1940) and part owner or in agreement with Glanzstoff, Snia Viscosa, Enka.

> Practically every viscose producing company of importance in Europe is now party to the Courtauld-Glanzstoff-Snia-Viscose cartel.
>
> (*The Economist*, May 12, 1928.)

British Celanese was still a rival and oil companies provided only the means of making motor engines go.

And Sir Alfred Mond had started, in November of the birth year of I.C.I. negotiations with the T.U.C., to have joint talks 'with the twin objects of the restoration of industrial prosperity and the corresponding improvement in the standard of living of the population'. Point one was Rationalisation of Industry, including arrangements for the transference of labour and so on, the usual catalogue of proposals for industrial peace.

Today we find that Mr. Paul Chambers, head of I.C.I., is saying:

> We need to discard outmoded economic ideas on such matters as monopoly and monopolistic competition . . . much of modern industry was bound to be concentrated into big units as the requirements of capital, research and development increased the optimum size of the economic unit. . . . Some competition could be a gross misuse of resources. . . . The blunders of surplus capacity will grow worse unless we recognise that some form of planning and forecasting is essential for the survival of private, competitive enterprise. . . . This would not mean that there would be no competition nor that there would be allocation of resources. The last thing we would want is planning such as exists in Communist countries; planning which kills initiative, enterprise and individual liberty.

How much he must wish that it did!

Though not as specific as Mond had been on international agreements, Chambers pleaded for 'improved information and better knowledge of the growth—or decline—of demand for particular products'. Though he thinks 'we cannot, of course, go back to the bad old days of cartels'! And he supported 'Neddy'.

Chambers is not, of course, the same type as Mond. He is a capitalist agent, coming from the City of London College and the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

School of Economics. After experience in India as Income Tax adviser to the (British) Government before the war, he became a Commissioner of the tax collectors (Board of Inland Revenue). He must have got experience in mergers from his stint as Chief of Finance Division, Control Commission for Germany British element 1945-47. Then, like Stamp, the prototype of many such, he left Inland Revenue for business. One of the charming things about the present turmoil is that Chambers is discovered as one of the Hampstead boys, dancing oranges and lemons or mending a greenhouse. Who ever heard of Alfy Mond mending a greenhouse? Or engaging in public brawls? Like God, whom he so much resembled, Mond moved in a mysterious way his wonders to perform. There was no overt row over I.C.I.—all a happy meeting—on a liner, wasn't it?

Mr. Chambers is not on 'Neddy'; perhaps, Mr. Lloyd agreed with Mr. Dudley Williams, M.P., who said in the House recently that he 'did not think Mr. Chambers was a suitable person to be in charge of a concern as important to this country as I.C.I.'—or 'Neddy'? But the resemblance between the general proposals of I.C.I.—control of 95 per cent of the U.K. output of man-made fibres and social peace—is as close now as it was all through I.C.I.'s history.

The situation now is that amount more acute than it was in 1927. There are two main problems. One is the rapid expansion of technical change. Petroleum is increasingly used as a base for raw material in place of coal. The oil consortiums of a capital size to dwarf it, don't necessarily play ball with I.C.I. Scientists' ingenuity is creating new materials. In addition to the inorganic chemicals (sulphuric acid, soda, caustic soda, chlorine, etc.) organic chemicals, plastics, dyes, fibres are extending their range of uses—incidentally modern packaging, based on chemicals, is changing distribution methods (it is the basis of supermarkets) while farming is dependent for good or ill, on chemical fertilisers. The consequence is that the old arrangements in the international field are meeting new rivals. The field is open. There is no 'Bridlington' agreement and until the new frontiers are established and new tariffs areas fixed, competition is bitter. In-fighting, with subsidiaries of rival capitals establishing themselves in home areas, is the rule. The market problem with the bulk of the world's population getting poorer is acute. In chemicals, too, there is, as Mr. Chambers complained at the Institute of Directors' last meeting, dumping—by U.S.A. But one of his lieutenants rather let him down by remarking that all chemical

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

exports were dumped. The automated flow of production can meet the home demand at cost and, at a trifling extra cost, export to get the profit—as Hollywood discovered—at almost any price.

To the shareholders ('The I.C.I. view') this is admitted:

> I.C.I.'s basic objective in seeking a merger with Courtaulds is to establish a British man-made fibres industry able to compete with the larger and more powerful American and European producers.

The second problem is management and the organising of scientists and research to get the latest saleable product first-est. Courtaulds, it has emerged during the current row, has beaten I.C.I. in the modernity of the fibres it has produced—as well as buying cheaper materials not from I.C.I. but from a squeezed U.S. firm, Allied Chemicals. The sharp replies given by the technical men of Courtaulds at their press conference—'you've got it the wrong way round' they said to the press men, 'it is I.C.I. that is inefficient'—and the board room revolution they promise, is an indication of its importance. 'Millstone House' as *The Times* sourly remarked.

There are problems for capitalism. They cannot be solved by capitalists. The solution I.C.I. tried to put across was left to be settled in the typical capitalist way, not by Government, not by application of managerial skills or facing the problem, but—by the shareholders. Which was the best bet? Keynes called the Stock Exchange a casino. In these latter days, it has resembled a bingo club. Not only did the rival companies produce rival promises of future profit and bonus shares, the workers concerned being disregarded, except by Mr. Cyril Osborne, M.P., who (he has a Courtaulds factory in his area) said that 'I do not blame my constituents for putting their plate out if they think that there is a lot of "lolly" going round'. But the whole important matter got involved in the Stock Exchange mechanism. The business involved millions of pounds of shares gotten from bewildered shareholders changing hands to get short term gains. Some of the leading City people shook their heads but the Astor's *Observer* appreciated that capitalism was come back again.

> There was some heartening news from British industry last week. The fuddy-duddies who still regard business as a gentle game of ludo have been decisively defeated. Despite strong pressure, they have been unable to persuade I.C.I. and Courtaulds to come to a 'friendly' agreement.
>
> (*Observer Investment Guide*, January 21, 1962.)

And again

> If Britain is going into a Market in Europe as big as the U.S., will British industry have to become as tough and ruthlessly competitive as America? Last week, as the I.C.I.-Courtaulds take-over battle opened,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> the first outline of an answer appeared. The two firms went to war like gangs of corner boys fighting in the back streets.
>
> (*Observer*, Pendennis, January 21, 1962.)

In fact, as we know, the attack was foiled by the shareholders. Stanley did not change sides at Bosworth. The 'family', we are told, owned 20 per cent of Courtaulds. Did they refuse to sell? And the regiment of rentiers, scattered up and down the land, part of the one and a quarter million of shareholders the managers of companies tend to forget—did they decide they did not like Mr. Chambers? Perhaps some insurance companies did not want too many of their eggs in I.C.I. Perhaps they backed Courtaulds to keep its promise of higher profits. There it is left—for whom?

For while all this we may regard with amusement and edification, picking up more, from a month's quarrel, of the workings of capitalism than in thirty years of reading Annual Reports, we regard it also with mortification. On the main issues—application of science to work-a-day problems, value of research, follies of tycoons, surplus capacity, falling rate of profit, the false solution of capitalist monopoly—we know the answers. If we do not here is Mr. Harold Wincott, the wisest of the City's advisers, to tell us:

> The Courtaulds-I.C.I. affair has played into the hands of the opponents of capitalism just as every other volte-face in the post-war era has played into their hands. (*Financial Times*, March 6, 1962.)

It is an open secret that the near loss of Middlesbrough in 1950, due to the voting of the deluded workers in I.C.I. who held a few shares in it against the proposal that I.C.I. should be nationalised. led to the abandonment of the proposal by the Labour Party. 'Clause Four' may be back in the Rules but it is not in the programme. After reciting in the House of Commons the allegations of the contestants, Mr. Callaghan, M.P., winding up for the Opposition, on February 14, said: 'This all adds up to an impregnable case for an inquiry by an independent body which could look into some of these issues'.

What, except for clearing up who was lying about whether I.C.I. prices were higher than those of its continental rivals or whether I.C.I. or Courtaulds had bought the best patent from some U.S. or Italian inventor, could such an inquiry do? The Coal Commission of 1919 it is true did better: it advocated nationalisation of the mines. But then it had committed socialists on it, using it to prove the point. The trouble now is that Chambers and the rest have proved the point but there are no committed socialists in the leadership.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CUBA TRAVEL NOTES

D. N. Pritt, Q.C.

2. The Political Parties

[*Following upon the description last month of the interview with Fidel Castro, Mr. Pritt describes meetings with Blas Roca and Che Guevara, the Deputy Prime Minister. It covers many important matters, not yet fully understood in this country, including the key questions of relations between the parties—Ed.*, L.M.]

January 23. This afternoon I was in the building which houses O.R.I. (Organisaciones Revolucionarias Integradas). This body comprises the three political parties which remained faithful to the revolution. Until the united El Partido Unido de la Revolucion Socialista (P.U.R.S.) was founded recently, O.R.I. has been the guiding political force of government and country. Its effective head, for very many years the general secretary of the Cuban Communist Party, in its various forms, legal and illegal, is Blas Roca. Hearing that I was in the building, Roca asked me and one or two people who were with me to come and talk with him. We were together over an hour.

He is one of the two outstanding Marxist-Leninist theoreticians. He is *simpático*, but plainly—as his history has demanded—a strong man, who is quite a good deal older than Castro, Che Guevara and other leaders, who are in their thirties. He talked to us in a very frank and friendly way, beginning with a statement of the history of O.R.I., and then went on as follows:

O.R.I. is formed out of three political groupings or parties. The first is 'the Twenty-sixth of July'. It takes its name from the famous (unsuccessful) attack on the Moncado fortress on July 26, 1953, led by Fidel Castro, being founded some time after it. It was mainly composed of workers, but contained elements of self-employed people, some professional workers, and some petty bourgeois (which Roca put into English as 'middle-class').

(Castro himself, who belonged to this party, described it in a speech published in book form in January, 1962, under the title of El Partido Unido de la Revolucion Socialista as 'representing, in the first place, the peasants', adding that it had of course many other elements in it.—D.N.P.)

The second grouping, founded on March 13, 1957, after the attack on the presidential palace, is the Directorio revolucionario,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

formed originally by students, especially university students, but with some 'professional' and some secondary school people.

The third was founded in 1925 as Partido Comunista Cubano; in 1939 it fused with others and was re-named Partido de la Union Revolucionaria Comunista; in 1943 the name was changed again to Partido Socialista Popular. It was a working-class party, Marxist-Leninist.

The first of the three had a programme of radical reforms and national liberation and was definitely anti-imperialist. The second had a similar programme, rather less definite. The third was of course Marxist-Leninist. In the revolutionary struggle against Batista, these three parties marched 'parallel and together'; and they arrived at definite agreements on unity in the course of the struggle.

There were other organisations (bourgeois) that also fought against Batista, with limited programmes, sometimes not much more than 'down with Batista'. All have vanished from the scene. One, called 'ortodoxo' split into many fragments fairly early; its youth finally joined the 'Twenty-sixth July' and by 1959 it was no longer visible. Another, called 'autentico', led by Carlos Prio, lasted longer. It formed the so-called 'segunda frente de Escambrey'. In 1960-61 it turned counter-revolutionary; its leaders emigrated; it lost all support and disappeared. A third, Christian-democrat, founded in 1959, made a lot of noise and propaganda; it failed, turned to sabotage and other criminal activities and 'went to Miami'. One of its leaders 'came back' as a Playa Gironista and was captured.

(That is, they took part in April, 1961, in the invasion which landed at Playa Giron, and collapsed in seventy-two hours.—D.N.P.)

Thus the original three parties mentioned are all that still remain; and since the triumph of the revolution they have always been in agreement on the essential points:

to support the revolutionary government;
to support Fidel Castro as its leader;
to support the Reforma agraria and the Reforma urbana; and
to support the nationalisation of enterprises.

All three have declared for Socialism.

(To put shortly a development which is the subject of a good deal of writing and perhaps a little confusion, I would say that the revolution was not clearly a socialist revolution in its inception, but that it has unmistakeably become one in the course of less than three years, largely by the clear determination of the people. The Playa

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Giron invasion, and the reaction of the people to it, did much to crystallise and to confirm this determination.—D.N.P.)

That situation, Roca continued, permits us to go forward to form one unity, one united party, out of the three separate (if 'integrated' and very happily married) bodies; and we have decided to do this.

(That is why O.R.I. at the moment is in a state of flux, of re-formation and later dissolution.—D.N.P.)

We had to settle one problem when taking that step forward: whether we should form a united front of the three or a complete fusion. We have chosen fusion 'to avoid rivalries'. Rivalries are not necessarily bad; but with the struggles we have on our hands, with the United States of America so near, with U.S. influence still great in Latin America, and the colossal ability of the U.S. to send agents here to cause trouble, such rivalries might have bad results. We are invincible if we keep closely united, but divisions might be dangerous.

Our fusion is on the basis of three points:

1. programme: the construction of socialism
2. ideology: Marxist-Leninist
3. form of organisation: democratic centralism.

The work of fusion (establishment of the new party) has already been carried a good way. We have formed united committees—national, provincial and municipal—and 'revolutionary nuclei' in enterprises, co-operatives, state farms and so on. All that constitutes the first step towards framing the constitution of the new party, and we are now at work on that. In due course we will hold a congress to approve the programme and statutes, and we will then (in March, 1962) proclaim the new United Party. It will be 'the directing party of the revolutionary state'.

(Then Roca answered questions summarised below.—D.N.P.)

The decision to unite the three was taken in 1960. The three parties were all illegal from 1953 on.

There is a national committee at the head of O.R.I.; a provincial committee in each of the six provinces; a municipal committee in each of the 126 towns; committees in granjas (state farms), co-operatives, factories, offices, military units, and so on; in most such there are groups called 'nucleos revolucionarios'. Nuclei are also formed in places where workers are working as middle or poor

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

peasants. There are also such nuclei in trade unions and organisations of women of youth and of small-holders.

No one can say how large the membership of the new party will be; we are still organising it, seeking quality rather than quantity, and moving carefully. We do not admit everyone who says 'I was in the Sierra'. We study their history, their background, their activities in the revolution, and so on, and accept or reject them. The work of selection of members of the new party has been running already for some time.

We are doing a great deal of educational work. In regular whole-time courses, we have 15,000 militants studying revolutionary communism—Marxism-Leninism—(sometimes eight month courses, sometimes four, and for those confining themselves to basic study, three months); and there are 40,000 attending study circles, mostly in the evenings, somewhat irregularly.

In addition, we are doing a great deal of publishing. Our publication of the *Communist Manifesto* has gone into 500,000 copies. We publish a manual which we have written of Marxist-Leninist political economy, another on historical materialism, and others. We have had very large sales; for example, our monthly review, *Cuba Socialista,* sells 200,000 copies.

(He gave us signed copies of his own Los Fundamentos del Socialismo en Cuba; *mine was one of the new—the* 8th*—edition of 100,000 copies.—D.N.P.)*

Further, we do practical explanatory work: Castro, Che Guevara, Dorticos and I myself, as well as others, give lectures with many listeners (including over radio and television; I am doing one this evening). 'What books are of especial interest, apart from the *Communist Manifesto* and our own manual?' Lots; probably the most important is Lenin's *State and Revolution.*

I put as our *first* and most important task: To win in the planning and development of our economy. Now that we have no *latifundia (the previous large landed estates.—D.N.P.)* or capitalists, we can rely on ourselves; everything depends on our work; we have to 'do no more than succeed'.

I put as our *second* most important task: Defence.

(Surely, the first occasion on which any modern statesman or politician has put Defence second rather than first.—D.N.P.)

Yes, we *are* threatened by invasion. The U.S.A. is sending in agents, it is using its lackeys, it is doing a Punta del Este; so we

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

must prepare. We have the weapons and the men. The whole people is armed; the workers and peasants have arms and are learning to use them better. They used them well enough at Playa Giron. I think the U.S. *will* try again; historically, it is inevitable. Playa Giron was a trial run; the Yanquis are saying they had not enough planes and will use more next time. Yes, they will come, and they will fail. True, there are strong forces against their risking it again; they have failed to line up the Latin American countries against us; Latin American solidarity has developed very well. See in particular events in Venezuela, which are to us a *most* significant support.

(At this period demonstrations in Caracas, largely directed to support for Cuba, were being held regularly, although fired on by the police with fatal results. As one Latin American said to me: 'The Venezuelan working class must be the most class-conscious of all; it is ready to be shot down in the streets of its own capital in the interests of the workers of Cuba'.—D.N.P.)

Moreover, Afro-Asian solidarity with us is good; there have been many demonstrations for us in India. Besides, the solidarity of the socialist countries is unlimited and continuous. That offers the only ground for hoping that the U.S. may never attack. But we are always preparing; if they bring ten times as many, we will put in the field against them twenty times as many!

The *third* most important task: to raise the level of our revolutionary conscience and the ideological level of the people.

So ended this most interesting interview with Blas Roca.

January 10. Today the whole delegation lunched with Che Guevara, the deputy prime minister. He is a young man, of quite astonishing ability and much humour. He answered a very long series of questions (many of them of little importance, in my opinion) very fully and frankly. It was impossible to take notes at the time, or for some hours afterwards, so I have no record of the detail of most of what he said. One point, however, on which he was very clear was that the *elan* of the revolution would last a very long time; that it was indeed actually growing; that the April, 1961, invasion at Playa Giron had greatly strengthened it; and that people's conception of duty had turned from what he called 'cold duty' to 'warm duty'. He also said, quite frankly: 'Yes, there is absenteeism; it is quite a problem; and it is due to the fact that some industrial activities are pretty well paid, and that people in those fields can earn enough in a couple of days to keep them and their families for a week'.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

January 25. Today President Dorticos, speaking at the 'meeting of chancellors' of the Organisation of American States, read as part of his speech a formal declaration of his government:

'The Cuban revolution has brought true democracy to our country for the first time—government of the people, by the people, for the people. The full enjoyment of democracy is possible only where—as is the case in Cuba—the people have won social and economic liberty, and therewith the possibility of free expression. There is no democracy where there is misery; in Cuba misery is disappearing. There is no democracy where there is unemployment; in our four year plan we shall eliminate unemployment. There is no democracy where there are rural evictions; in Cuba the peasant owns the land he tills. There is no democracy where there is racial discrimination; in Cuba all men are equal. There is no democracy where there is illiteracy; Cuba has eliminated illiteracy'.

In today's daily newspaper, *Hoy*, I find the following:

(*a*) 'The Punta del Este Conference was addressed by the delegate of Guatemala—I mean, the United Fruit Co. He began: "Ladies and Gentlemen, I wish you a very good banana!" '

(*b*) 'Sources generally well informed report that there was a dramatic moment when the delegate began to read a speech which had already been delivered by another delegate. One of Rusk's *aides* had given the same text to the other delegate, whilst another Rusk *aide* gave it to the Guatemala man. A third Rusk man, from the Central Intelligence Agency, was just in time to stop it.'

BOOKS

The Levellers and the English Revolution

H. N. Brailsford

The Cresset Press. 716 pp. 55s.

London and the Outbreak of the Puritan Revolution

Dr. Valerie Pearl

Oxford University Press. 364 pp. 42s.

THE BATTLES of the English Revolution are not over yet. They continue to rage, in the columns of learned journals and, in a far profounder sense, some aspects of those revolutionary decades are still with us even in the England of the mid-twentieth century. In the years of the revolution, with the entry for the first time into the political arena of the 'little people', who proclaimed the equality of all men in the eyes of God and the law, and declared roundly that political sovereignty lay in the people as a whole and was delegated only on trust to the rulers, ideas of incalculable power had been broadcast. They could be driven underground for a time by persecution, censorship and repression but the ideas could not be destroyed.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It was left to Marxist scholars to rediscover in this century the revolutionary heritage of England, and an account of the Leveller movement, almost wholly disregarded by the classical historians, was badly needed. We have it now, in the last book of the late H. N. Brailsford. Here, told in simple and living prose, is the story of 'Free-born John' Lilburne, fiery, quarrelsome and conceited; of Richard Overton, one of the most daring thinkers of that daring age; Henry Marten, witty and irreverent M.P.; and Gerrard Winstanley, the 'true Leveller' for whom even the Levellers were not thorough-going enough. It is also about the movement of which they were a part, for 'the first claim of the Levellers to originality lay in this, that they organised as a modern party, run on democratic lines' (p. 9). The party that these men organised was a party of the common people, 'the hobnails, clouted shoes, the private soldiers, the leather and woollen aprons and the laborious and industrious people of England', as Lilburne called them. They organised the soldiers of the army, with 'agitators' elected from the rank and file of the New Model. Through petitions (they claimed to have collected 40,000 signatures for one) and demonstrations, they brought the common people into politics as a force to be reckoned with. Brailsford shows that 'at decisive moments in the Revolution the intellectual and political initiative lay with the Levellers, and that Cromwell and the Independent Grandees followed their lead'. So there came that astonishing moment in English history when in 1647 the Army leaders sat down with the rank-and-file agitators at Putney to discuss political first principles. In their own time, the Levellers failed. Was it because they were 'in advance of their time'? Was it inevitable? The answer is given, partly by Brailsford, and partly by Christopher Hill (who edited Brailsford's uncompleted manuscript). The Levellers represented the class of independent small masters and craftsmen and their like; for all their progressive views, their schemes of manhood suffrage was only partial. It excluded dependents and 'servants', and this meant in the 17th century, all wage earners. The basis for a mass movement in their time lay in the countryside, among the peasantry who rose every now and then in protest and pulled down the fences. The Levellers failed to provide them with an effective political organisation and leadership. When the decisive moment came in 1649 they were isolated and destroyed. At Ware the insurgent Levellers waited in vain for a demonstration of Spitalfield weavers to join them—it never came. At Burford they did not hope even for that. From the other side, the revolution started as a struggle within the propertied classes, and in the last resort, the bourgeoisie, however revolutionary,

CLASSIFIED ADVERTISEMENTS

(3s. 6d. a line, minimum, 10s. 6d. Cash with order to: 'Class. Ads.', Labour Monthly, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.)

DUPLICATING, Verbatim Shorthand, Typing (tapes, etc.), Translating. Mabel Eyles, 10, Beaconsfield Road, London, N.11. ENT 3324.

INTERESTING opportunity on progressive magazine for lively enthusiast, age to 40 years. Knowledge of labour movement useful. Box No. 431.

VETERAN L.M. readers: your early copies and pamphlets may be invaluable to others. Send details to: L.M. Exchange Service, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.

WE BUY books, pamphlets, Lab. Mvt., Spain, Russia, Comintern. We collect. The Hammersmith Bookshop, Beadon Road, W.6. RIV 6807.

URGENTLY REQUIRED—All back numbers of *Labour Monthly* from 1921-1930 inclusive and 1939.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

were prepared to assert the rights of property against 'levellers' even if it meant, as in 1660, a restoration of the monarchy. They were, in truth, revolutionaries against their will, and if the revolution developed as far as it did, it was because at each stage there were groups prepared to carry it further. Sooner or later, however, they were bound to call a halt. Nowhere is this clearer than in London, for London was the nerve-centre of the kingdom and it was in London that the revolution began.

How had London initiated the first move? The Whig picture of an united metropolis rising in unison against a tyrannical Court 'when the cause of public freedom was in peril' will no longer stand. There are no spontaneous revolutions, and the breakthrough in London was achieved as a result of a struggle whose story is told in painstaking detail in Dr. Valerie Pearl's book. For while (in 1638) John Lilburne lay in prison and breathed fire, men in other places, nearer the centre of power, were about their business, less vociferous but no less effective. The spearhead of that struggle inside the City of London, whose municipal government was dominated by a tightly-knit oligarchy of royalist supporters, was 'little Isaac' Penington. As City member in Parliament he shaped and directed the pro-parliamentary opposition within the city government until in December, 1641, he was able to organise and carry through a successful coup. He went on to become Lord Mayor. He had realised the importance of arousing into action people who were not likely to see the inside of Parliament house. Not unnaturally the honourable members and the City oligarchs resented it. The Earl of Bristol was heard to deplore 'irregular and tumultuous assemblies of people, be it for never so good an end'. The people were there to be ruled; they had no business to meddle in the higher mysteries of politics. Penington and his friends (the 'new men', Mrs. Pearl calls them) proved too radical and too much of an embarrassment to his Parliamentary allies. In 1643 he was succeeded as Mayor by a moderate: the revolutionary fervour had gone out since the dangerous days of 1642 when ordinary men and women had manned the City defences against Royalist attack, the radicals were isolated and could not consolidate their position. Penington went bankrupt, and died in the Tower in 1661.

There are morals to this story, but they are there to be read, especially in Brailsford's great and moving book. It reads like a story of defeat, but that defeat could only be temporary. After the 'dirty people of no name' (as Clarendon called them) had asserted their rights for a few hectic years and been suppressed, there began the long struggle to win recognition for the people whom even the Levellers had forgotten. When the working class raised its head again two centuries later, its leaders would carry forward the work of the Levellers in the English Revolution which is yet to be completed.

DIPAK NANDY.

Correction: On page 105 line eleven for 'I.C.I.' read 'Unilever'.—Ed., *L.M.*

Published by the proprietors, The Trinity Trust, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3, and printed by Wembley News, Wembley, Middlesex, Great Britain. Registered for transmission by Magazine Post to Canada, including Newfoundland.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(Continued from page ii of cover)

hearts of those who follow him, will persist until the dawn of socialism, and after.' He adds that his father 'always insisted that every youth into whose hands we could put an L.M. was a potential leader in the fight for Peace and Socialism.' Many such potential leaders, as yet still very youthful, will be marching this Easter from Aldermaston to Trafalgar Square: it is right that they should know in whose footsteps they are following.

Certainly it has been really encouraging to see the increase—slow, perhaps, but very sure—in orders won for L.M. even since January. Of course, what we value most are the *regular* orders; these have been recorded from Yorkshire, Scotland, Nottinghamshire and South Wales particularly, and to a somewhat less extent from a number of other places. But in addition there has been a whole number of special sales both of the February number, with Castro's unique speech, and of March, with D. N. Pritt's *Cuba Travel Notes,* Ted Hill's hard-hitting article on 'Neddy' etc. In fact, we had to 'up' the print. These special sales are important, because they put L.M. into new hands. If every reader who successfully recommended Castro's speech was to follow this up with Pritt's Travel Notes, or Ted Hill's in March with John Newton's (page 169), we should soon be making many, many new 'potential leaders'. I was delighted to learn recently of some splendid examples of support amongst the younger people. In Scotland, of course, young miners have long since been L.M. fans; but it is also true in engineering and other industries. One young man in Stirlingshire sells 30 copies a month; a group of young people in Renfrewshire have set themselves a target of 100. Meanwhile, thanks—and congratulations—to all who have seen an opportunity to win a new reader and have acted upon it. Well done, the Scots, Southampton, Swindon and Surrey! February donations totalled:

£85 3s. 5d.

REGULAR DONATIONS came from: M. Brandt, 2s 6d; Marie Philibert, 10s; 'Oliver Twist and Friends', £1 10s; G.I., 13s; 'In Memory of Joe Brien', 3s; R.F.B., £3; 'Anon', Whitchurch, 1s; L. Bates, 5s; Blackburn Branch and Jerry, 1s 6d; Oldham Branch, 1s; 'In Memory of Cyril Moss', £10; 'Daisy Bell', £10; Windfall, £10; C.T.H., £4; L'Humanite, 4s; D. H. Strathern and Friends, £1; L. Perkins, 2s 6d; S. Morrissy, £1; F.G.A. (Canada), 10s; M. Illing, £1; H. Brindle, 15s; 'S. Mill', £1; The Humphrey's Family, 5s; R. Dodd, £1; K. Forge, £1; B. W. MacKay, 4s; E.J.B., 10s; 'Socialist Sailor', £1; J. A. Purton, 7s 6d; A.M.T. for Fernando and Guilherme, Portugal, 1s.

OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS INCLUDE: A. Ramage, 10s; R. Winstone, 2s; F. Wignall, 2s; D. Lewis, £1; B. Rogerson, 5s; H. Pyne, 7s; Hugh Hunter, £1; B. Ainley, 10s; W. Hickson, £1; Mrs. L. Gallop, 10s; A. Beak, £1; P. J. Wallis, 18s; C. Herring, 5s; Mr. and Mrs. Walker, 5s; P. Tregidga, 2s; 'L.M.C.', 4s 6d; L. J. Thatcher, 2s; D.E.T. (Australia), £1; M. Hall, £1; D. A. Ware, 2s; P. Watters, 3s; F. Colman, 3s; J. Wyatt, 2s; T. Foran, 3s; W. Harmer, 2s 6d; J.K.W., 10s; J. Lipetz, £1 18s; M. E. Diplock, 2s; P. Feltham, 2s; P. W. Ghosh, 5s; J. A. Fraser, 10s; Mrs. D. S. Spencer, 2s 6d; K.J.A. (Canada), £1; R. Borsley, 7s; A. W. Elliot, 2s 6d; C.H.B., £1; B.B. (U.S.A.), 7s 5d; H.A. (U.S.A.), £17 13s.

Our thanks to you all.

Co-op. No. L.99482.

ANGELA TUCKETT,
134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.
FINchley 5135.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WHY NOT BY POST?

NAME .....
(Please use block capitals)

ADDRESS .....

.....

I enclose 18s. (if by wrapper, or £1 if by envelope), for year's subscription from.....

(SIGNED).....

To LABOUR MONTHLY
134, BALLARDS LANE, LONDON, N.3

LABOUR MONTHLY

Bound Volume 1961

It's a history of the year and a permanent record

ORDER NOW

From your usual newsagents, price £1.5.0d., or send 10s.6d., plus 1s.6d. postage, and your loose copies as soon as possible to:

THE MANAGER,
134, BALLARDS LANE,
LONDON, N.3.

Binder Bros. Ltd.
Building and decorating by craftsmen
STAmford Hill 4096

MIMETTE FURS LTD.
Wide range of furs, coats, stoles and capes.
117 High Street, Croydon, Surrey.
'Phone: CROydon 4328.

LABOUR RESEARCH
'Arms and the Money'
'Coal Crisis'
'Differential Rents'
1s. or 1s. 2½d. post free from
Labour Research Department
161, Drury Lane, London, W.C.2

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED